





3

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/866,068	05/24/2001	Chih-Chong Wang	60594-300401	6861
75	90 01/24/2003			
PERKINS COIE, LLP			EXAMINER	
101 JEFFERSON DRIVE MENLO PARK, CA 94025-1114			PATEL, NIHIR B	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3743	
		DATE MAILED: 01/24/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

## Application No. Applicant(s) 09/866.068 WANG ET AL. Advisory Action Examiner **Art Unit** Nihir Patel 3743 -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --THE REPLY FILED 21 October 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] a) The period for reply expires 1 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on ... Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: (a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or (d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). 5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached sheet. 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) will not be entered or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: \_\_ Claim(s) rejected: 1,2,4,5 and 8-17. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_. 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_. 10. Other: \_\_\_\_

Application/Control Number: 09/866,068

Art Unit: 3743

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on October 21, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Shimada does disclose a stabilization plate 12 set around the thermal pad for making the thermal pad closely contact the die 40 of the chip and the heatsink does comprise a right portion (middle portion) and a left portion respectively having a first plurality of cooling fins and a second plurality of cooling fins, of which the second cooling fins are fewer in number than the first cooling fins.

The applicant argues that Glenn fails to disclose a stabilization plate 12 that has a thickness that is less than that of the die. Glenn states that the heat spreader/stabilization plate can be made to any dimensions desired therefore the stabilization can have a thickness that is less than the die or more than the die.

Henry Bennett

G10 19 3700